

REMARKS

Formal drawings are submitted herewith. Appropriate Figure numbers have been added to Figure 6, Figure 8, and Figures 10-12.

The error pointed out by the Examiner in the paragraph beginning at page 6, line 16 has been corrected through the above amendment.

Claims 1-15 are in the case. The Examiner has indicated allowability of claims 6-15, while rejecting claims 1-5. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly set forth applicants' invention, which will be described in detail further on in this paper.

Initially, claim 4 was "objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim". Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 fully complies with 37 CFR 1.75(c) in that claim 4 does further limit claims 1 and 2. Claim 1 recites "first and second regions of the tool body inside-by-side relation between an adjacent thereof parallel lines", while claim 4, dependent from claim 1, recites "and further comprising first and second regions of the tool body in side-by-side relation between an additional adjacent pair of lines" (underlining added by applicants for emphasis). Thus, claim 4 further limits claim 1 by adding this additional structure. That is, claim 1 in effect calls for adjacent parallel lines to have therebetween first and second regions, and claim 4, incorporating all of claim 1, further adds the limitation of calling for an additional pair of lines to have therebetween first and second regions.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 4 fully complies with 37 CFR 1.75(c).

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 USC 112. The Examiner states, with regard to claim 1, "It is not clear how a set of parallel lines form an outline". It is to be noted that claim 1 calls for a first plurality of sets of opaque, substantially parallel lines on the body, forming a first outline, and a second plurality of sets of opaque, substantially parallel lines on the body, forming a second outline (underlining added by applicants for emphasis). Thus, an outline is formed by a plurality of sets of lines, and not "a set of parallel lines" as suggested by the Examiner. Reference is made to Figure 9 of the present application, along with the accompanying text in applicants' specification (page 5, lines 32-36, and page 6, lines 1-8), wherein it is clearly set forth that the outline 152 is formed by the sets 144, 146, 148, 150, each such set including a plurality of lines, and similarly, outline 168 is formed by the sets 160, 162, 164, 166, each such set including a plurality of lines.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 1-5 fully comply with 35 USC 112.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 over Brunner et al. (5,300,786), and also stand rejected under 35 USC 102 over Barr et al. (5,756,238). It is respectfully submitted that these claims as amended should be allowed thereover.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly set forth applicants' invention, now calling for first and second regions of the tool body in side-by-side relation between an adjacent pair of parallel lines, the first region separating one of the adjacent pair of parallel lines from the second region, the second region separating the first region from the other of the adjacent pair of parallel lines. Reference is made to Figures 9 and 10 of the present application, wherein it is clear (referring to for example the top portion of Figure 9) that for an adjacent pair of lines, the region 158 separates one of those lines from the region 156 (Figure 9), and the region 156 separates the region 158 from the other of those lines (see also Figure 10). The specification has been amended as indicated above to conform to the drawings.

In Brunner et al., no such limitation exists. Rather, in Brunner et al., and in particular Figures 6-8 cited by the Examiner, for an adjacent pair of lines, all regions extend from one line to the other thereof, i.e., there is no first region separating one of the adjacent pair of parallel lines from the second region, the second region separating the first region from the other of the adjacent pair of parallel lines, as specifically called for in amended claim 1. It will readily be seen, in reviewing applicants' drawings and specifications, that applicants' configuration is fundamentally different from that of Brunner et al., and applicants' amendment to claim 1 is made in furtherance of clearly setting forth this fundamental difference.

For these reasons, claim 1 as amended is respectfully submitted to be allowable over Brunner et al.

Claims 2 and 3, dependent from claim 1, are respectfully submitted to be allowable on the basis of this dependency.

Claim 4, dependent from claim 2, is initially respectfully submitted to be allowable on the basis of his dependency. Claim 4 is also respectfully submitted to be allowable on the basis of calling for first and second regions in side-by-side relation between an additional adjacent pair of lines. As set forth above, such structure does not exist in Brunner et al. in relation to a first-mentioned adjacent pair of lines, and thus clearly does not exist in relation to an additional adjacent pair of lines. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 4 should be allowed on this basis also.

Claim 5, dependent from claim 4, is initially respectfully submitted to be allowable on the basis of this dependency. Claim 5 is also respectfully submitted to be allowable on its own merit. The Examiner states “Brunner also discloses the plurality of lines that form first and second outline in wherein the second outline is positioned within the first outline (Fig. 8)”. In applicants’ claim 1, from which claim 5 is dependent, after establishing a first plurality of sets of parallel lines (which sets form a first outline), and a second plurality of sets of parallel lines (which sets form a second outline), claim 5 adds the limitation that the second outline is positioned within the first outline. This is clearly not the case in Brunner et al. No plurality of sets of parallel lines forms a first outline, with a second plurality of sets of parallel lines forming a second outline, and thus the limitation of claim 5 cannot be met. Therefore, claim 5 is respectfully submitted to be allowable over Brunner et al. on this basis also.

Claims 1-5 also stand rejected under 35 USC 102 over Barr et al. It is respectfully submitted that these claims as amended should be allowed.

As noted, claim 1 has been amended to make it clear that the first and second regions of the tool body are in side-by-side relation between an adjacent pair of parallel lines, the first region separating one of the adjacent pair of parallel lines from the second region, the second region separating the first region from the other of the adjacent pair of parallel lines. Thus, claim 1 is now limited to the association of the first and second regions with adjacent parallel lines. The Examiner in rejecting claim 1 over Barr et al. relies on “an adjacent pair of lines which are part of the first and second set of lines”, wherein the first set of lines are vertical, and the second set lines are horizontal (Figure 2 of Barr et al.). Applicants have made this amendment to clearly distinguish over Barr et al. by precisely setting forth that the adjacent pair of lines involved are parallel lines, as opposed to perpendicular lines in Barr et al., along with the further limitation that the first region separates one of the adjacent pair of parallel lines from the second region, and the second region separates the first region from the other of the adjacent pair of parallel lines. This amendment having been made in furtherance of setting forth the clearly fundamental difference between applicants’ invention and the disclosure of Barr et al., nowhere is such structure disclosed in Barr et al. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 1 as amended should be allowed over Barr et al.


Claims 2 and 3, dependent from claim 1, are respectfully submitted to be allowable on the basis of this dependency.

Claim 4, dependent from claim 2, is initially respectfully submitted to be allowable on the basis of his dependency. Claim 4 is also respectfully submitted to be allowable on the basis of calling for first and second regions in side-by-side relation between an additional adjacent pair of lines. As set forth above, such structure does not exist in Barr et al. in relation to a first-mentioned adjacent pair of lines, and thus clearly does not exist in relation to an additional adjacent pair of lines. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 4 should be allowed on this basis also.


Regarding claim 5, the Examiner states "Barr also discloses the plurality of lines that form first and second outline in wherein the second outline is positioned within the first outline (Fig. 2). As set forth above, in applicants' claim 1, from which claim 5 is dependent, after establishing a first plurality of sets of parallel lines (which sets form a first outline), and a second plurality of sets of parallel lines (which sets form a second outline), claim 5 adds the limitation that the second outline is positioned within the first outline. This is clearly not the case in Barr et al. No plurality of sets of parallel lines forms a first outline, with a second plurality of sets of parallel lines forming a second outline, and thus the limitations of claim 5 cannot be met. Therefore, claim 5 is respectfully submitted to be allowable over Barr et al. on this basis also.

While applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of claims 6-15, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-5 as amended should be allowed. Reconsideration and allowance of such claims are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Paul J. Winters  
Reg. No. 25,246  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

I certify that this document is being deposited on July 10, 2003 with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail under 37 C.F.R. §1.8 addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Signature 

Paul J. Winters  
Typed or printed name